



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/691,005	10/22/2003	Horst Bansemer	5015.1005	5679

23280 7590 11/17/2004

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC
485 SEVENTH AVENUE, 14TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10018

EXAMINER

HOLZEN, STEPHEN A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3644

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/691,005

Applicant(s)

BANSEMIR ET AL.

Examiner

Stephen A. Holzen

Art Unit

3644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 11, 13, 15 and 18-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9, 10, 12, 14, 16 and 17 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/26/2004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 9/15/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant has argued that Struzik does not disclose a transverse force-absorbing guide however the examiner disagrees. The examiner asserts that #23 & #20 are transverse force absorbing guides that resist transverse and lateral loads. Furthermore the applicant's arguments are more persuasive than the claims allow for. The applicant has argued that Struzik does not disclose any force acting in a direction transverse to the direction of movement, however the claim actually says, "a transverse force-absorbing guide element *configured* to absorb a force in a direction transverse to the direction of movement." The force is not an element of the claim, furthermore, the force absorbing guide element need only be configured to absorb a force when present. Struzik does reads on both of these elements. The applicant further argues that the first and second connection structures of Struzik are integral, and therefor do not read on the claim. The examiner cannot find in the claim any limitation that requires the first and second connection structures to be separate elements (un-integral). Finally the applicant has argued that Struzik does not disclose an energy-absorbing element uncoupled from a transverse load path of the transverse force absorbing guide element. The examiner respectfully disagree. The energy-absorbing element (#17) is completely separate from and uncoupled from the transverse force absorbing guide element (#20).
2. The application arguments with respect to Mouille are persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) The invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-5, 8, 15, 18, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Struzik et al (2003/0057318 A1).

Re - Claim 1: Struzik discloses an impact-absorbing, load-limiting connection device, comprising a first connection structure (#18); a second connection structure (#19 and #21), at least one of the first and second connection structures being moveable with respect to the other in a predetermined direction of movement corresponding to an anticipated main impact direction; a guiding mechanism (#24) configured to guide at least one of the first and second connection structures along the direction of movement, the guiding mechanism including at least one transverse force-absorbing guide element (#23) configured to absorb a force in a direction transverse to the direction of movement, and at least one impact-absorbing, load-limiting sacrificial element (#17 and #20) disposed between the first connection structure and the second connection structure and uncoupled from a transverse load path of the transverse force-absorbing guide element, wherein the sacrificial element is configured to be deformed

Art Unit: 3644

and destroyed by a relative movement between the first and second connection structures in the direction of movement upon application of a predetermined maximum load.

Re - Claim 2-5, 15, 18, 19 and 20: Struzik et al discloses every aspect of the applicant's invention. (See figures 1, 3 and 5 and Paragraphs #50, 51)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 6, 7 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Struzik et al. Struzik et al discloses every aspect of the applicant's invention except wherein, the tubular sacrificial element includes a fiber composite material, wherein the fiber composite material is wrapped and wherein the force-absorbing guide element has a quasi-isotropic transverse stiffness. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a tubular sacrificial element includes a fiber composite material, wherein the fiber composite material is wrapped and wherein the force-absorbing guide element has a quasi-isotropic transverse stiffness since it has been held that a mere reversal of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. In re Einstein, 8 USPQ 167.

Art Unit: 3644

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 9, 10, 12, 14, 16 and 17 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen A. Holzen whose telephone number is 703-308-2484. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Teri Luu can be reached on 703 305-7421. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sah



TERI PHAM LUU
SUPERVISORY
PRIMARY EXAMINER